## Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

## ORIGINAL

000018267

MAR 1 6 2005

GEED BY 1 1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION

e w han but

Pod	KETED BY BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPO	RECLIVED 26
3	COMMISSIONERS JEFF HATCH-MILLER - CHAIRMAN	2005 MAR 16 P 4: 38
4	WILLIAM A. MUNDELL MARC SPITZER MIKE GLEASON	AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL
5	KRISTIN K. MAYES	
6	IN THE MATTER OF ARIZONA PUBLIC	) DOCKET NO. E-00000A-02-0051
7	SERVICE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF	
8	A.A.C. R14-2-1606.	
9	IN THE MATTER OF THE GENERIC	) ) DOCKET NO. E-01345A-01-0822
10	PROCEEDING CONCERNING THE ARIZONA INDEPENDENT SCHEDULING	
12	ADMINISTRATOR.	
13	IN THE MATTER OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR A	DOCKET NO. E-00000A-01-0630
14	VARIANCE OF CERTAIN ELECTRIC COMPETITION RULES COMPLIANCE DATES.	)
15		)
16	IN THE MATTER OF TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR A VARIANCE OF CERTAIN ELECTRIC	) DOCKET NO. E- 01933A-02-0069
17	COMPETITION RULES COMPLIANCE DATES.	TUCSON ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO THE
18		AISA PROCEDURAL ORDER
19	Tucson Electric Power Company ("TEP"), thr	ough undersigned counsel, hereby files its
20	response to the Procedural Order dated February 18, 2	2005 and filed in the dockets captioned above
21	regarding the status of the Arizona Independent Scheo	duling Administrator (the "AISA Procedural
22	Order"), as follows:	
23	INTRODUCTION.	
24	On January 25, 2005, the Arizona Court of	Appeals issued a mandate in Phelps Dodge
25	Corporation, et. al. v. Arizona Electric Power Coope	rative, Inc., et al., 207 Ariz. 95, 83 P.3d 573
26	(App. 2004) (the "Phelps Dodge case"), indicating	that the Arizona Supreme Court denied the
27	petition for review of that case.	

On February 2, 2005, Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. ("AEPCO") filed a copy of the mandate with the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") and requested that official notice be taken thereof. Further, AEPCO stated that the Court of Appeals' determination in the Phelps Dodge case that A.A.C. R14-2-1609 (C) – (J) was invalid mooted proceedings in Docket No. E-00000A-01-0630 the ("AISA docket").

On February 18, 2005, the Presiding Administrative Law Judge issued the AISA Procedural Order which, among other things, solicited responses (i) to AEPCO's filing; and (ii) the effect of the Phelps Dodge case on the AISA docket.

## TEP's RESPONSE.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In the Phelps Dodge case, the Court of Appeals stated:

[A.A.C. R14-2-1609] subsections (C)-(J), which the Cooperatives challenge, direct Affected utilities to each create an independent scheduling administrator and a scheduling coordinator to oversee fair access to transmission services in a manner substantially prescribed by the Commission.

In sum, we hold that the Commission lacked constitutional or legislative authority to promulgate R14-2-1609 (C)-(J). (Id at 113)

Section 4.2 of the TEP 1999 Settlement Agreement (Decision No. 62103) provides that TEP's cost for variable must-run generation shall be billed directly to scheduling coordinators in accordance with AISA protocols and shall be included in the standard offer generation charge.

Section 9.1 of the TEP 1999 Settlement Agreement provides that TEP shall fully support the development of the AISA, and shall modify its FERC Open Access Transmission Tariff to be fully compatible with the AISA Bylaws and Protocols Manual.

The Phelps Dodge case makes it clear that those provisions of A.A.C. R14-2-1609 that provide for the creation of the AISA are neither valid nor enforceable. This state of affairs calls into question the status of Sections 4.2 and 9.1 of the TEP 1999 Settlement Agreement and TEP's duties and responsibilities in connection therewith. TEP believes that, in light of the Phelps

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

27

Dodge case, it is appropriate for the Commission to provide notice of the steps it will take, if any, regarding (i) the AISA-related Electric Competition Rules; and (ii) any terms of settlement agreements (such as the TEP 1999 Settlement Agreement) that are based upon the invalidated AISA related rules.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 11<sup>th</sup> day of March 2005.

ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC

Raymond S. Heyman

Michael W. Patten One Arizona Center

400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Attorneys for Tucson Electric Power Company

1	Original and 22copies of the foregoing
2	filed this 11 <sup>th</sup> day of March 2005 with:
3	Docket Control
4	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
6	Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed this 11 <sup>th</sup> day of March 2005 to:
7	Chairman Jeff Hatch-Miller
8	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
9	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
10	Commissioner Marc Spitzer
11	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
12	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
13	Commissioner William A. Mundell
14	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
15	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
16	Commissioner Mike Gleason
17	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
18	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
19	Commissioner Kristin K. Mayes Arizona Corporation Commission
20	1200 West Washington Street
21	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
22	Jessica Youle, Sr., Staff Attorney Jana Brandt, Reg. Agcy. Rep.
23	Jan Miller Salt River Project
24	Mail Station PAB300 P. O. Box 52025
25	Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2025
26	Christopher Hitchcock, Esq. Law Offices of Christopher Hitchcock, PLC
27	P.O. Box AT Rishee A 7 85603

1	ACAA
2	2627 N. 3rd Street, Suite 2 Phoenix, AZ 85004
3	Michael Grant Gallagher & Kennedy
4	2575 E. Camelback Rd. Phoenix, AZ 85016
5	
6	Douglas C. Nelson Douglas C. Nelson, P.C.
7	7000 North 16th St., Suite 120-307 Phoenix, AZ 85020
8	Jeffrey Crocket
9	Snell & Wilmer 400 East Van Buren One Arizona Center
10	Phoenix, AZ 85004
11	Herb Hayden Jana Van Ness
12	Barbara Klemstine Arizona Public Service Company
13	P. O. Box 53999 Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999
14	Michael A. Curtis
15	William P. Sullivan Martinez & Curtis
16	2712 North Seventh Street Phoenix, AZ 85006-01090
17	·
18	Kenneth C. Sundlof, Jr. Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, P.L.C. Two N. Control, 16th Floor
19	Two N. Central, 16th Floor Phoenix, AZ 85004-2393
20	Robert S. Lynch
21	Arizona Transmission Dependent Utility Group 340 E. Palm Lane, Suite 140
22	Phoenix, AZ 85004-4529
23	Rick Gilliam LAW Fund
24	2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200 Boulder, CO 80302
25	David Berry Western Resource Advantes
26	Western Resource Advocates P. O. Box 1064 Scottadolo A 7 85252 1064
27	Scottsdale, AZ 85252-1064

1	
1	Kenneth R. Saline
2	K.R. Saline & Associates 160 N. Pasadena, Suite 101 Mesa, AZ 85201-6764
3	
4	Vincent Hunt City of Tucson 4004 S. Park Ave., Bldg #2
5	Tucson, Arizona 85714
6	Lyn A. Farmer, Esq.
7	Chief Administrative Law Judge Hearing Division
8	Arizona Corporation Commission
9	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007
10	Christopher C. Kempley, Esq.
11	Chief Counsel, Legal Division Arizona Corporation Commission
12	1200 West Washington Street
13	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
14	Ernest G. Johnson Director, Utilities Division
15	Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street
16	Phoenix, Arizona 85007
17	Michelle Livengood Tucson Electric Power Company
18	One South Church Avenue, Suite 200 Tucson, Arizona 85701
19	1 405011, 1 1120114 03 10 1
20	$\Omega_{\alpha}$
21	By Mary Sprolits
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	